THE ROLE OF ISLAM IN THE ACADEMIC DISCOURSES ON THE NATIONAL IDENTITY OF MUSLIMS IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA, 1950-1980

Armina Omerika

Abstract: *While the Yugoslav Communists pursued a repressive policy against Islam in the first rougly two decades after WWII, from the mid-1960s and throughout the 1970s Bosnian Muslims largely benefited from a period of liberalization in Yugoslavia, leading to the elevation of the Muslims to the status of one of the official state nations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, alongside the Bosnian Croats and Serbs, in 1974. The state attempted to create a secular Muslim nationhood separate from religious affiliation. However, the political debates over the status of Bosnia within Yugoslavia and over Bosnian historical unity were intrinsically linked to the discourse on Muslim history, culture, and identity. The article argues that the creation of a purely secular Muslim nation ultimately failed, and that it did so because the academic discourses (e.g., in the State* ***Oriental Institute*** *in Sarajevo) that legitimized the Bosnian Muslim national identity were intertwined with Islamic institutions (like the* ***Gazi Husrevbeg Madrasa****) and associations (like the scholars' association* ***Ilmija****), their journals (like* ***Takvim*** *and* ***Preporod****), as well as informal networks of Muslim scholars (like Husein Djozo). The most important topics in this mixed secular and religious discourse on national identity (to which also Bosnian exiles in the West made important contributions) were the historical continuity provided by the Bogumil theses, the pecularities of Bosnian Sufi Islam, and the special status of Bosnia within the Ottoman empire. The reformist Djozo, in his* fatwas *on issues like clothings and inter-ethnic marriages, argued not for a purely Islamic identity, but for an*

Armina Omerika is Assistant Professor of History, St. Lawrence University Canton, New York (USA).

acknowledgement of the historical traditions of Bosnian Muslims in general. Other scholars and academics discussed the question how to designate the language and literature of the Bosnian Muslims. By the late 1970s, the Communist leadership began to fear the disintegration of the multinational republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina along ethnic lines and curbed Muslim efforts to reevaluate their cultural heritage. This culminated in show trials against former members of the ***Young Muslims*** *network, including Alija Izetbegović, who would later be the first president of independent Bosnia and Herzegovina. The debates of the 1960s and 1970s thus laid the groundwork for the new definition of the* ***Bosniak*** *Muslim nation after the breakup of Yugoslavia.*

I

The consolidation of state power in the socialist Yugoslavia in the years following the end of the Second World War deeply transformed the social structure of the Bosnian Muslims (Bosniaks). The Yugoslav constitution of 1946 declared the separation of state and religion while simultaneously guaranteeing the freedom of the latter. In practice, however, Yugoslav socialists, who strongly relied on the Soviet state model in the initial stage of state building, pursued the path to socialism in a radical way. Between 1945 and 1953, this meant the marginalization of religion by means of expropriation, arrests, and public campaigns. The state undertook drastic measures to discipline and control the religious institutions and their representatives. Consequences for Islamic religious practice and the Bosnian Muslim society in general were significant. Religion was excluded from the public sphere and underwent a process of privatization; the old Bosnian Muslim elites lost their influence, which had been often tied to the strong impact of Islamic religion on Muslim society.

In addition, Bosnian Muslims were not recognized as a separate nation within the Yugoslav state.[1] Yugoslavia was structured as a federation of six republics, five of which were defined by the principle of sovereignty of its majority nations. Bosnia and Herzegovina, established as a sovereign republic after initial struggles among the Communists, was a complicated case in so far as its population comprised large groups of Orthodox Serbs, Catholic Croats, and Muslims. The latter had a distinct identity, but lacked a national denomination other than the religious one. Bosnia and Herzegovina *per definitionem* did not have a state nation, as the Communists were reluctant to invoke a concept of an overall Bosnian identity that would supersede the loyalty to the single ethnic groups. Instead the Communists decided that it was a republic of "parts of the Serb and Croat nations and of the Bosnian Muslims"; the latter were regarded as not having yet "decided on their national identity".[2] Bosnian Muslims were thus confronted with the options to declare themselves nationally either as Serbs or Croats of Muslim creed or as "nationally undeclared" in the national census. While the Muslim intellectual and political elites had partially endorsed a

Serb or Croat national identification during the first half of the 20th century as well as in the first decades of Communist rule, the large majority of the Muslim population refused a national identification as Serbs or Croats. In fact, the Yugoslav nationality policy towards the Bosnian Muslims in the roughly first two decades after the establishment of the Communist rule was based upon the tacit assumption that Muslims would eventually assimilate into the Serb or Croat nations.[3]

Since the mid-1960s and during the 1970s Yugoslav society experienced a period of liberalization, and Bosnian Muslims largely benefited from this development. The new policy was caused by several factors, including a generation change in the League of Communists (the Communist Party was renamed the League of Communists in 1952) and a shift in foreign policy. Yugoslav leadership became involved in the Non-Aligned Movement that included many Islamic countries, and this had a significant impact on both the official status of Bosnian Muslims and on the forms of their religious and social organization. In the census of 1971, the overwhelming majority of Bosnian Muslims declared their nationality as "Muslim in the sense of a nation", a designation which was sanctioned by the new Yugoslavian constitution three years later.

The official affirmation of a separate national identity of Bosnian Muslims was supported by the Bosnian Communist leadership, since it contributed to the strengthening of the interests of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a republic within the Yugoslav federation. In the political debates on the decentralization of the Yugoslav federation, a Muslim nation also meant reinforcing Bosnian statehood within the Yugoslav federation as Bosnia ceased to be merely a "hinterland" of Serbia and Croatia.[4] It is not surprising, therefore, that the political debates over the status of Bosnia within Yugoslavia and over Bosnian historical unity were intrinsically linked to the discourse on Muslim culture and identity. The official affirmation of a separate national identity was also strongly promoted by academic debates about Bosnian Muslim cultural and historical identities. During the 1960s and 1970s, Muslim Marxist historians produced a huge corpus of works on the history of Bosnian Muslims, and provided a scholarly justification for the legal recognition of a Muslim state nation.[5] One of the unresolved problems with the notion of a Bosnian Muslim nationality even after its official recognition in 1974 remained the equation of the name for a religious community with that of a national denomination: How could, for example, an atheist of Muslim nationality be separated from a Muslim believer? A distinction was obvious in the written form, since the word *Musliman* spelt with a capital "M" designated the nationality regardless of religious attachment, while the word *musliman* with a minor "m" indicated solely a Muslim believer. The orthography, however, could not alter the close relationship between the two forms of identities reflected in the language.[6] Yugoslav Communists for their part were generally anxious to emphasize the clear distinction between the religious affiliation and the national identity: blending of religious questions with politics or ethnicity was generally suspected to be a "politicizing of religion" or "clerical nationalism",[7] and consequently the Communists tried to deprive the term *national* of any religious connotation. Western anthropologists have demonstrated since the mid-1970s that this distinction was not as clear as the official dogma would have had it,[8] and the fruitlessness of these attempts was finally exposed

during the 1980s, when it became clear that for many Bosnian Muslims their national identity was still attached to Islam.

In this paper, I am arguing that one of the reasons why the attempts to separate the secular, national Muslim identity from the religious affiliation failed was the centrality of Islam in the academic discourses that legitimized the Bosnian Muslim national identity in post-World War II Yugoslavia. The history and culture of a distinct Muslim community in Bosnia could not be viewed independently from the process of Islamization, the complexities of Muslim Ottoman rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and from the Islamic influences in literature and other forms of cultural production. Furthermore, I am arguing that the discourses on the national identity of Muslims in Bosnia were not restricted to academia, but that the religious sphere provided a significant impetus to these debates as well. Islamic writings of Bosnian Muslim scholars such as Husein Djozo (1912-1982) contained many elements which were crucial to the construction of a Bosnian Muslim national identity. Finally, I am going to show that the secular academia and the religious sphere were often intertwined with the Islamic institutions—press and mosques—acting as a multiplier of the intellectual identity discourses and as a medium between the academic research and the Muslim population of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Islam in the Historical and Oriental Studies

It has been argued that the process of the academic affirmation of a distinct Bosnian Muslim nationhood required references to historical state traditions, since the Bosnian Muslim historians, as Richard Crampton put it, recognized that religion alone "was of little use in the formation of national consciousness without a sense of a national past. Most nations which demanded recognition of their existence had some past state which, to them, legitimized their claim to a separate identity."[9] References to an own national past, however, could not claim a distinctiveness without taking into account the religious—in this case Islamic—component, as this was still the main point of distinction between the Bosnian Muslims and the Bosnian (Catholic) Croats and (Orthodox) Serbs. The question of the ethnic origin of Bosnian Muslims and their development into a national community became strongly tied to the question of the Islamization of Bosnia and the status of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Ottoman Empire, which became important topics of historical analysis. In the context of historiographical traditions in South Eastern Europe, in which the national emancipation largely figured as a product of the liberation struggle against the "Ottoman yoke",[10] the insistence that the Ottoman Islamic rule had a positive impact on the development of cultural distinctiveness of Bosnian Muslims achieved a controversial character. The issue that was at stake was whether the Ottoman conquest of a Yugoslav land had disrupted or enforced the alleged historical continuity with the medieval state traditions in the Balkans; as Fikret Adanir remarked: "Serb and Croat historians have maintained that Islam stands for discontinuity, while claiming at the same time that their own communities represent the true medieval tradition."[11]

The question of the ethnic origin of Bosnian Muslims became a popular topic of historical studies long before Muslim historians themselves explicitly addressed the question of the

Muslim nation building. The works of the Sarajevo historian Alexandar Solovjev about the medieval Balkan population of Bogumils and the medieval Bosnian Church, published in the late 1940s[12] advanced the thesis about an individual origin of the Bosnian Muslims. The interest of Marxists in the Bogumil community can be explained with the general tendency of Marxist historiography to view heterodox religious groups and movements as actors of social anti-feudalist protest.[13] The Bogumils in Bosnia, Solovjev maintained, had been a decisive factor for the allegedly quick process of Islamization; he claimed that the medieval Bosnian Church was essentially of Bogumil character, and that the Bosnian peasant population had embraced Islam as a result of pressure to conversion by the established churches, particularly the Catholic Church. A number of theological affinities between the Bogumil creed and Islam facilitated a mass conversion of the members of the Bosnian Church to Islam, a process which was accomplished during the 16th century. This "Bogumil thesis" has since been elaborated as well as criticized by various historians,[14] and even the 1975 publication of John V.A. Fine's study on the Bosnian Church which became academic consensus on this issue[15] could not prevent the occasional outbreaks of polemics related to the Bogumils, as a recent debate among Bosnian historians in the Bosnian press shows.[16] For the Bosnian Muslims, however, this thesis had most welcome implications: It provided a scholarly justification for a distinct origin and thus a historical legitimization of an identity formation that evolved independently from the Serb and Croat communities. The image of the Bosnian Muslims as "traitors" to the Christian belief of their ancestors had been particularly popular in the Serb and Croat nationalist discourses since the 19th century.[17] Now this image could be altered by referring to a historical heritage originating in a heretical, i.e. non-Catholic and non-Orthodox Christianity and to the commonalities between this religious tradition and Islam. Most importantly, the thesis about the Bogumil character of the Bosnian Church from which the Bosnian Muslims descended implied a historical continuity between the Bosnian medieval state and Muslim ethnicity; in this perspective, Islam emerges not as an element of historical discontinuity, but instead as the bridge between a medieval state and the modern collective identity of the Muslims.

Research on the period of Ottoman rule in Bosnia provided further elaborations, but also important qualifications of this thesis. To be sure, the question of the nature of Ottoman rule in Bosnia was initially not raised in the context of Bosnian Muslim nation building. The historical inquiry into the Ottoman rule in Yugoslav lands evolved in the context of a state-sponsored historiography, which had an interest in Ottoman feudalism as one of the historical stages in human history as defined by Karl Marx. Still, academic dissent was possible even in this atmosphere; as Wayne Vuchinich, an American historian of Bosman origin, observed in 1955, it was "refreshing to see that, despite a rigid application of the Marxian formula to all historical developments, Yugoslav historians do reach opposite conclusions and hold divergent views."[18] The polemics concentrated on the question whether the Ottoman feudal system was "conservative" or "progressive" as compared to the economic and social structure of the medieval Balkan states that had preceded it, as well as on the relationship between indigenous feudal and church elites and the Ottoman state apparatus.[19] It is interesting to note that one of the first historical controversies that emerged in this

context was not related to Bosnia and Herzegovina, but to Montenegro and the scope of its autonomy under the Ottomans in the 16th and 17th centuries.[20]

Despite the ideologically determined research agenda and the corresponding criticism of the previous "bourgeois" historiographical traditions,[21] the works in question were based upon a rich corpus of historical sources in the Ottoman-Turkish language, some of which were analyzed for the first time. It is therefore not surprising that the historians involved were scholars trained in the academic discipline of Oriental studies. The 1950 opening of the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo and the simultaneous establishment of a chair of Oriental Studies within the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Sarajevo launched a stage of intense translations of Ottoman sources and historical research on Ottoman rule in Bosnia. During the first decade of the Institute's existence, the title of the bulletin of the Oriental Institute (*Journal of Oriental Philology and History of Yugoslav People under Turkish Rule*) reflects the emphasis on translation and editing of historical sources pertaining to Ottoman rule in Yugoslav lands;[22] only in 1960 was the name of the publication shortened to the more general *Journal of Oriental Philology*.[23] The associates and employees of the Institute, such as Branislav Djurdjev,[24] Nedim Filipović,[25] Hamdija Kreševljaković, Šaćir Sikirić, Hazim Šabanović, Adem Handžić, Hamid Hadžibegić, Muhamed Mujić, Omer Mušić, Teufik Muftić, Avdo Sućeska or Besim Korkut–to name but a few–emerged soon as the most important researchers of the Ottoman period in Bosnia. It is interesting to note that many of the Institute's Muslim associates had at least partially enjoyed a classical Islamic education in the Sarajevo Gazi Husrev-beg Madrasa *(Gazi Husrev-begova medresa)*, at the Higher Islamic School of Shari'a and Theology (*Viša islamska šerijatsko-teološka škola*, closed 1945), or even from the al-Azhar University in Cairo; the historian Šaćir Sikirić was even a Sheikh of the Naqshbandiyya brotherhood in the Bosnian town of Fojnica.[26] Their knowledge about the Islamic religion and particularly their language proficiencies were valuable resources for the emergence of Oriental studies in Bosnia. Most Oriental scholars with an Islamic educational background worked primarily in the area of language education, including the publication of dictionaries and grammar handbooks, and in the bibliographical section, editing and translating historical documents (B. Korkut, Salih Alić, T. Muftić, M. Mujić). Some graduates of Islamic educational institutions, however, such as N. Filipović, H. Šabanović, A. Handžić, A. Sućeska or Ešref Kovaèević, gained a considerable academic reputation with analytical historical studies.[27] Their works, as well as the Ottoman studies conducted at the Oriental Institute in Sarajevo in general, provided the backbone of the discourses on the national identity of Bosnian Muslims which were to emerge in 1960s, during a process which a current Bosnian national historian called "the second cultural and national renaissance of the Bosniaks".[28]

Some scholars, however, looked at the development of a Bosnian Muslim identity independently of the question of their historical origin. Such was the approach of the ethnologist Spiro Kulišić, who in 1953 stated that a distinct ethnic identity of Bosnian Muslims emerged through the progress of history and that the question of origin is therefore obsolete: "Secluded by religion and its special status under the Turks, the Muslim population has developed into a separate and stable ethnical group."[29] By contrast, the many works of

Muslim historians on the Islamization show that the question of the origin of Bosnian Muslims continued to be important during the 1960s and 1970s.[30] The works of the Bosnian Muslim historian Nedim Filipović in particular provided important qualifications of the "Bogumil thesis", reducing the importance of the Bogumils for the Islamization without, however, calling into question the continuity of a Bosnian people from the medieval times through the Ottoman period.[31] Without explicitly addressing the question of the formation of a Muslim ethnical or national identity, a number of historical works on economic and social history of Ottoman Bosnia focused specifically on the development of a Muslim society. These works promoted the thesis already implied in Kulišić's work that Bosnia had a special status within the Ottoman legal and economic system.[32] The notion of Bosnian "exceptionality" was justified with a specific treatment of certain economic institutions by the Ottomans,[33] the specific role of local nobles,[34] and the high degree of autonomy of Bosnia within the Ottoman Empire. The uprisings of Bosnian-Muslim peasants of the 17th and 18th centuries[35] and the resistance of local nobles to the centralization in the 19th century[36] were interpreted as attempts at retaining national autonomy vis- à-vis the center of Ottoman power. In addition, one study even claimed that the Bosnian Muslims as the elite group of the country formed a diversified "society" much earlier than the Bosnian Serbs and Croats.[37]

The ideologically and politically determined emphasis on social and economic history of Ottoman Bosnia did not leave much space for the study of the religious implications of Islamic rule in Bosnia. Within this limited space, Sufi Islam particularly attracted the attention of historians. Sufism was important in two respects: First, the syncretism of the Sufi brotherhoods was said to have facilitated the conversion of the Christian population to Islam and thus to have accelerated the process of Islamization; and second, the religious tolerance of the Sufis was regarded as a driving force behind socially motivated and ethno-confessionally mixed uprisings against the Ottoman administration, some of which were even interpreted as Communist movements.[38] In this context, the Sufi brotherhood of Hamzawiyya attracted particular attention, as it was regarded as a purely indigenous, Bosnian brotherhood with a particularly strong revolutionary nimbus.[39]

The revitalization of the "national question" in the broader Yugoslav political context since the beginning of the 1960s was accompanied by the intensification of the discourse on nation building and the development of national identity in Bosnia. In 1964, the Yugoslav Communists departed from the dogma that nations were doomed to "wither away"; from that time on and through the 1970s, Bosnian Muslim historians such as Atif Purivatra, Enver Redžić, Muhamed Hadžijahić and Mustafa Imamović addressed the public with a number of works on the national identity of Bosnian Muslims.[40] The focus of the historical works shifted from the Ottoman period to the formation of a modern national identity among Bosnian Muslims in the period of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia (1878-1914) and the time of the Yugoslav monarchy (1918-1941). These historical studies depicted the Bosnian Muslims as a nation which was distinguished by its history, culture, institutional development and collective self-consciousness from both other Bosnian nations and other Muslim population groups of Yugoslavia. In late 1968, A. Purivatra and M. Hadžijahić

published a first draft bibliography of works dealing with the historical pattern of national self-declaration of Bosnian Muslims.[41] Purivatra especially could exert a considerable political and public influence through his function as a member of the Commission for Interethnic Relations with the Central Committee of the Bosnian League of Communists between 1967 and 1972.[42] One result of his public activities was a brochure on the "national question" which he co-authored with the sociologist Kasim Suljević, and which was published shortly before the population census of 1971.[43] The brochure was basically an instruction to the Bosnian Muslims on how to declare their national identity in the census.

The works of these Bosnian Muslim historians of the 1960s and 1970s did not transgress the dominant framework of the definitions of nation as stipulated by Party ideologues of the time.[44] Muslim historiography, however, provided a scholarly foundation for the constitutional elevation of Bosnian Muslims to one of the six Yugoslav state nations. They attacked the premise that Muslims had to "choose" one of the already established nations (expressed in Bosnian by the term *opredijeliti se*). By demonstrating that Bosnian Muslims already *were* an established nation, the concept of the "choice" of a national identity could be dismissed as an unsustainable political construct.

Criticism of the scholarly argumentation for a Muslim nation as well as of the role of the Bosnian Communist leadership in this process came from different sides, but critical voices which came from the Muslim camp showed that even the Muslim intelligentsia itself did not have a unified view on the Bosnian Muslim nationality. The sociologist Esad Ćimić declared in a television interview shortly before the population census of 1971 that nations could not be exchanged "like shirts"; according to Ćimić, it was too late for the Bosnian Muslims to become a people, and too early to become a nation.[45] Ćimić, himself a Muslim, openly declared himself to be a Croat.[46] This interview had a broad resonance in the Bosnian public, and it did not take long until Ćimić's remarks were condemned by the Party organs of Bosnia for violating the official Party position on the "national question".[47]

The differences between the sociologist,Ćimić and historians like Purivatra did not originate in any fundamental opposition. The review which Ćimić had written on Purivatra's 1969 publication *The National and Political Development of the Muslims*[48] was in fact very favorable and revealed a similar criticism of the "artificial" self-declarations of Bosnian Muslims as Serbs and Croats.[49] Rather, the conflict emerged from Ćimić's tenacity to view the Islamic religion as the main determinant of the collective identity of Bosnian Muslims.[50] This, of course, went against the Party doctrine of keeping religion and nation separated.

In recent years, the works of the aforementioned Bosnian Muslim historians have been criticized for various other reasons. Non-Muslim scholars such as Sreæko Džaja have maintained that these works on the history of Bosnia have placed too strong an emphasis on the Bosnian Muslim history. According to Džaja, by stressing the thesis of continuity between medieval and Ottoman Bosnia, Muslim historiography has overemphasized the connection between the history of the country and the development of Muslim society while simultaneously marginalizing the historical and cultural heritage of Bosnian Serbs and Croats.[51] Other contemporary Bosniak historians who do not share Džaja's accusation of an exclusive approach have voiced their discontent with the works of their older colleagues

on different grounds. Since the term *Bošnjak* (Bosniak) became widely accepted as a distinct national designation by the majority of Bosnian Muslims during the 1990s, current Bosniak historians have tended to criticize the subordination of the historians in the 1960s and 1970s to the Communist-driven strategy of recognizing the Bosniak nation under a religious name.[52] In his assessment of the historiography on the Muslim nation, Enver Redµić, for example, maintains that he himself had been advocating the use of the term *Bošnjak* instead of *Musliman*. In his evaluation of a the aforementioned bibliography on the national question of Muslims by Purivatra and Hadµijahić,[53] Redµić observes: "Already at the beginning of this contribution we see that the main motive and the rationale behind the project was to academically deny and disavow the *bošnjaštvo* as a historical Bosnian national phenomenon in order to scholarly argue for the concept of a 'Muslim nation'."[54] From this perspective, the affirmation of a Muslim nation, supported by Bosniak historians and Bosnian communists alike, appears to be a historical betrayal: By consequently rejecting the term *Bošnjak* as a national domination and fostering a national terminology which overlapped with the name for a religion, the Communists allegedly denied the "true" nationality of the Bosnian Muslims, which was the *bošnjaštvo*. Redµić's criticism of his colleagues who followed the line of Bosnian Muslim communists is, however, too harsh; after all, the works in question provided the scholarly foundations not only for the recognition of a Muslim nation, but also for the assertion of *bošnjaštvo* as a national concept during the 1990s.

At the high peak of the academic and political debates about a Bosnian Muslim nation, the proponents of the Bošnjak option were in a strong minority. It is true that Redµić himself discussed the term *bošnjaštvo* in his article "About the Specificity of the Bosnian Muslims" as early as 1970.[55] He differentiated between two meanings of the concept: First, as a consciousness of a Bosnian state tradition that developed independently of confessional and ethnical identities, and second, as the ethnical identity of specifically Bosnian Muslims.[56] Redµić's thesis found no support in the political climate of the Yugoslavia of that time, and academic support for it was even weaker. The most important advocates of *bošnjaštvo* were located outside of Bosnia and Herzegovina anyway. They consisted of political exiles in Austria and Switzerland grouped around the Vienna-published journal *Bosanski pogledi* (*Bosnian Views*, published once in 1955 and later regularly between 1960 and 1967).[57] The most important activists in this group were Adil Zulfikarpašić, a former anti-Fascist resistance fighter and descendent of an old Bosnian aristocratic family,[58] Teufik Velagić, a former member of the Young Muslim organization (*Mladi Muslimani*) living in exile in Vienna, and the likewise Vienna-based Oriental scholar Smail Balić (1920-2002). However, not until 1962 did they approach the public with their concept of a national *Bošnjak* identity. Furthermore, their view of *bošnjaštvo* was everything but free from contradictions, as it oscillated between the inclusion and exclusion of the Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Croats into the *Bošnjak* identity.[59] Balić's renowned work on *The Culture of the Bošnjaks*, published in 1973,[60] is an excellent example of this tightrope walk: The qualification of the name *Bošnjak* in the subtitle of the book ("The Muslim Component") suggests a broader meaning of the word stretching beyond the Muslim part of the population of Bosnia; however, Balić is concerned with the presentation of the Islamic culture only. The concept of *bošnjaštvo*

advocated by the exile community since the 1960s is not to be equated with today's understanding of the word as sanctioned in the Bosnian constitution of 1994. The tendency even among the exiled secular intellectuals to define only Muslims by this word was strong, but it was by no means constant. It is important to note that the exile community reacted to the political and academic discourses on Muslim identities in Yugoslavia, but it is difficult to determine the impact of their own discourses on the debates within the country. The thesis according to which there was no interaction between the discourses in and outside of the country[61] must be, however, viewed with strong suspicion, as contacts between Muslim activists in Bosnia and individual political activists of the exile community are well documented.[62]

Furthermore, the main advocate of the *bošnjaštvo* in exile, Zulfikarpašić, was not the champion of a purely secular *Bošnjak* identity, as he himself claimed particularly after 1991,[63] for a considerable part of *Bosanski pogledi,* published and for the most part edited by Zulfikarpašić himself, was devoted to religious issues. From the start, *Bosanski pogledi* focused on news, articles and critical editorials about the activities of the Islamic Community in Yugoslavia, religious festivities, works by Islamic scholars from Bosnia, and biographies of outstanding religious notables. The first issue of the journal in 1960 even introduced a separate column entitled "Questions and Answers", a *fatwa*-like rubrique in which readers were encouraged to ask questions about religion. The responses were allegedly authored by "two former Qadis, (both) holders of doctoral titles in philosophy and theology, one Islamic scholar as well as professors from the al-Azhar (University) in Cairo".[64] A close examination of the identity discourses among the exile community with an emphasis on the role of Islam in their conceptualization of *bošnjaštvo* is something to be yet done; however, it is certain that the religious dimension of Islam was much more pronounced in their writings than this was commonly acknowledged later.

Disputes about Muslim Literature

Literature was another field where the national identity of Bosnian Muslims was argued and debated; indeed, disputes on the name of the literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina and on the inclusion of certain Muslim writers in literary anthologies were carried out very fiercely and became heavily politicized.

The profound interest of Bosnian Ottomanists in the Bosnian literature of the Ottoman times started in the mid-1960s and intensified during the 1970s.[65] A breakthrough in this field was H. Šabanović's work on the literature of Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Oriental languages (1973).[66] This book was published in the same year as Smail Balić's *The Culture of the Bosniaks,* one part of which dealt with the same topic.[67] Balić, working and living in Vienna, could freely use the national designation *Bošnjak,* and his work was welcomed by his Western colleagues.[68] By contrast, scholars within Bosnia who advocated the existence of a specific Bosnian Muslim literature under the Ottomans were confronted with counter-arguments by non-Muslim Ottomanists and Orientalists.[69] What was basically at stake was the name of the literature and whether works from Bosnia written in Oriental languages could be described as Bosnian or Muslim literature or as Ottoman literature

from Bosnia and Herzegovina.[70] Although the discussion was led in an academic language, the issue had strong national overtones, and the debates on Muslim literature would evolve into nationalist polemics in the late 1970s and at the beginnings of the 1980s.

The question raised by the Marxist philosopher Muhamed Filipović in his 1967 essay "The Bosnian Spirit in Literature–What is That?"[71] can be regarded as a prelude to this type of debate. The essay, published in the respectable literary magazine *Život,* caused a wave of polemical reactions. Filipović's vantage point was the existence of a "Bosnian folk spirit" that has been formed and maintained through the experiences and attitudes of the inhabitants of Bosnia through its "thousand of years old" history. Filipović asserted a historical continuity of a united and inseparable Bosnia. He criticized nationalist tendencies in literature which tended to ignore or even attack this unity for the sake of national particularism, and positively acknowledged those works which had affirmed the indivisibility of Bosnia. The critical remarks were primarily directed against the national literatures of Bosnian Serbs and Croats; at the same time Filipović complained about the nationalist exclusion of the Islamic component from the Southern Slavic and in general European history. According to Filipović, Islam had significantly enriched Bosnian culture, and he asserted that certain characteristics of Islam, such as Puritanism, the absence of a church hierarchy and dogmatism corresponded with the already developed characteristics of the pre-Islamic Bosnian spirit and thus facilitated the assimilation of Islam into Bosnian culture. Filipović concluded that the Bosnian Muslims were profoundly different from other Muslims since their Islam merged with the Bosnian and in general Slavic folk traditions. Filipović, who enjoys the reputation of an eminent Bosnian intellectual, has frequently stressed the positive contributions of the Islamic religion to the intellectual history of Bosnia. This persistence, certainly combined with an idiosyncratic personality, made him a controversial figure in the Yugoslav public, where he was repeatedly accused of Islamic fundamentalism under the "mask" of Marxism. His prefaces to books like *Mevlud* of the Orientalist E. Kovaèević[72] or A. Izetbegović's *Islam between the East and the West* (1990) additionally fueled the accusations. Contrary to the accusations, Filipović did not reduce the Bosnian identity exclusively to its Islamic component; after all, the "Bosnian spirit" as he viewed it was a symbiosis of the cultural and historical experiences of all Bosnian peoples, which cannot be reduced to only one of its components.

In 1970, three years after the publication of *"The Bosnian Spirit"*, a symposium of the influential Bosnian publishing house *Svjetlost* showed that a recognition of a Bosnian Muslim nation had raised new questions about the denomination of literature in the Bosnian republic and that its very name was in fact a political issue.[73] A specific designation for the literary works written by Bosnian Muslims did not exist, and the question posed during the symposium was whether it is possible to speak of a Muslim literature in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in analogy to the literature produced by Bosnian Serbs and Croats which was "Serb" and "Croatian" literature respectively. The question of denomination was tightly connected to the issue of the representation of Muslim writers in literary anthologies.[74] The symposium resulted in new polemics in which the advocates of the term "Muslim literature" were accused of Muslim nationalism and those who went against it—mostly Serbian

writers— of Serb nationalism.[75] The debates were temporarily interrupted by the Bosnian League of Communists, which argued that the existence of three national literatures in Bosnia would put the republic in the danger of fragmentation.[76]

Further publications of Muslim literary critics and writers showed the degree of confusion among the Communists when it came to the point of acknowledging the role of the Islamic heritage for the concept of Muslim national identity, of which they actually were supportive. In 1972 the writer Alija Isaković published his book *The Pearls – A Selection of Muslim Literature,*[77] which was divided into four parts: folk literature; literature in Oriental languages; Alhamijado[78] literature, and modern literature. *The Pearls* was initially criticized by the Communist critics for not sufficiently acknowledging the writers' class background as a selection criterion; only a short while later it was reclassified by the Bosnian Party leadership as an expression of the legitimate struggle of Muslims for "national affirmation and freedom".[79] Another major publication, this time by Muhsin Rizvić, Isaković's colleague and professor of literature at the University of Sarajevo, on the *Literary Work of Muslim Writers in Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian Rule*[80] avoided the term "Muslim literature" in the title, but its tendency was obvious: to show the strong and enduring effect of Islamic culture upon the literary production of modern Bosnian writers. While this work passed without a major uproar, Rizvić's next major publication (1980) on the *Literary Life of Bosnia and Herzegovina between the World Wars*[81] spurred an intense public debate on Muslim nationalism. The period dealt with in this work was politically very sensitive; many of the writers whose works Rizvić analyzed in the context of the Bosnian Muslim cultural production were regarded as "reactionary" figures by his critics. Particularly Rizvić's Serb colleague from the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo, Pero Šimunović, launched public attacks on Rizvić which had little in common with scholarly criticism. In his essay on Rizvić's book,[82] Šimunović accused the work of being inspired by "Muslim nationalism", "Panislamism" and "Islamic fundamentalism".[83] He extended his attacks to other contemporary Bosnian Muslim intellectuals whom he called "servants of the fascists", "pro-fascist", "fanatical believers", and "clerical fascists".[84] In response, a whole range of Bosnian Muslim and non-Muslim politicians defended Rizvić, and also his publishing house publicly stated that the accusations lacked any ground. This, however, did not impress Šimunović; in fact, he concluded that the Bosnian political scene was defending Muslim nationalism and was not treating it in the same way as Serb or Croatian nationalism.[85]

Šimunović's accusations were not rooted in a realistic assessment of the Communist politics of the time. By the late 1970s, the initially benevolent position of Bosnian Communists towards the intellectual affirmation of a Bosnian Muslim identity had changed considerably. The Bosnian Communists had responded to the nationalist crises in Yugoslavia of the 1970s with a hardening of the Party line; fearing the disintegration of the multinational republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina along ethnic lines, the Communist leadership became suspicious of Muslim efforts to reevaluate their cultural heritage. According to Srećko Džaja, these efforts became incompatible with the goals of the Communists as much as the centrifugal tendencies of the Bosnian Serbs and Croats towards the capitals of Bosnia's neighboring republics.[86] While the Muslim historians of the 1960s had acted in unison with

the line of the Bosnian Party, the official mood now shifted towards apprehending Muslim nationalism.

In 1980, the Bosnian Communists commissioned a work by the Muslim writer Derviš Sušić titled *Parergon,*[87] which dealt in a popular scientific way with the relationship between the Islamic Community and Marxism as well as with the collaboration of Islamic officials with the Nazis in the Second World War. Sušić, himself the son of a *hafiz* and a popular writer who often integrated elements of Muslim culture into his works, particularly attacked the historian Muhamed Hadžijahić for his alleged falsifying of the role of certain Islamic organizations during the Nazi and fascist occupation of Yugoslavia, and for presenting them inaccurately in a favorable light. Sušić moreover complained that the Bosnian Muslim historians since the 1960s had too strongly tied the national identity of Muslims to the Islamic religion and to non-Communist historical personalities while simultaneously marginalizing or even ignoring the role of the Communists and of the People's Liberation Movement during the Second World War. In a preface to his work, Sušić expressed his clear commitment to Marxism, stating that "justice can only be found by basing one's assumptions of historical progress towards a better future upon the dialectical unity of nation and class."[88] In principle, *Parergon* was a backslide into the rhetoric of the immediate post-war period; the attempts of historians like Hadžijahić to unhinge the historical role of Muslim elites during the war from the chains of stereotypical denunciations with methods of historical science were now dismissed as a "paradigm" of a specific (Muslim) mentality which refuses a critical evaluation of its own past.[89] *Parergon* clearly displayed the determination of the Communists in Bosnia to resist what they now called "clerical nationalism". The pressure upon Muslim intellectuals increased even more after president Tito's death in 1980 and the Bosnian Communists' attempt to tighten the political and ideological strings even more. This development culminated in 1983, when thirteen Muslim intellectuals, among them some former members of the illegal anti-Communist network *Young Muslims* including the later president of the independent Bosnia and Herzegovina, Alija Izetbegović, were accused of attempted state terrorism in a staged trial. Before and during this trial hundreds of religious Muslims and of prominent Muslim intellectuals were put under scrutiny and interrogated by the secret service. Only a few years before, religious figures who had dominated the Islamic public sphere for over fifteen years had been removed from their positions and replaced by conformist officials. The replacements of these scholars were prompted by their increasingly open criticism of the regime; the public repudiation of *Parergon* in the journal *Preporod* provided the immediate pretext. In the aftermath of Tito's death, the regime thus turned against the very people whose activities in the previous decades had been used for the public justification of the Communists' nationality policies.

Islamic Justification of the Muslim Nationality

In addition to the emergence of a strong discourse on Muslim cultural and national heritage, the climate of political liberalization of Yugoslavia since mid-1960s facilitated the revitalization of Islamic structures in Bosnia.[90] A number of Islamic journals emerged or were enlarged, among others the bi-weekly *Preporod* (*Renaissance,* since 1970), the

publication of the Association of the 'Ulama (*Udruženje Ilmije Bosne i Hercegovine* or *Ilmija*), and *Takvim*, an Islamic calendar which had been published since 1951 but the size of which now was increased by a large section of texts and articles. The students of the Gazi Husrev-beg Madrasa in Sarajevo issued their own journal (*Zemzem*, since 1967). Numerous works on Islamic religion were translated from the Arabic and Turkish languages, and the first direct translation of the Qur'an into the Serbo-Croatian language appeared in 1977, authored by Besim Korkut, an Islamic scholar and employee of the Institute for Oriental Studies in Sarajevo. The number of mosques, including small places of religious worship (*mesdžid*), increased from 969 in 1960 to 2,055 in 1976.[91] The pilgrimage to Mecca flourished and the student exchange with Islamic countries increased significantly. Under the auspices of the president of the *Ilmija* association and the al-Azhar graduate Husein Djozo, a public forum for Muslim youth, the so-called "Youth Tribune" (*Omladinska tribina*) was created in one of the Sarajevo mosques (the *Careva džamija*), attracting a great number of Muslim high-school and university students to public presentations and discussions about Islam. After a student strike in the Madrasa in January 1972,[92] the Tribune was closed, but it reemerged again in 1978 in the form of another youth forum (at the *Tabaèki mesdžid*).

The writings of religious scholars acquired a new tone, considerably different from the official statements issued by Islamic authorities in the previous decades which had mainly served as legitimization for state policy. Husein Djozo, an al-Azhar absolvent and former political prisoner, emerged as the *spiritus movens* behind this new mode of religious discourse and as the most influential figure of Bosnian Islam in this period. The official organ of the Islamic Community was heavily influenced by him, as were the *Ilmija* publications *Preporod* and *Takvim*. Especially the former journal, which was edited by Djozo until 1978 (with interruptions) displayed an ostentatious openness for "secular" topics. Djozo's influence on a whole new generation of Muslims through his work as teacher in the Madrasa and since 1977 at the Faculty of Islamic Theology in Sarajevo as well as through the already mentioned "Youth Tribune" cannot be overstated. His reputation as a graduate of al-Azhar and his mastering of Arabic underlined his authority among the Muslims of Bosnia.

Djozo strongly recurred to the ideas of Islamic reformism as expressed by Muhammad 'Abduh (1849-1905) and Mahmud Shaltut (d. 1963). The influence of these Egyptian reformists was particularly reflected in Djozo's series of articles in *tafsir* and in the *fatwas* which he issued in a regular column in the official organ of the Islamic Community, *Glasnik Vrhovnog islamskog starješinstva u SFRJ* (GVIS). Djozo provided liberal interpretations of the Shari'a, thus reconciling the Islamic religious practice with the social realities of Communist Yugoslavia without submitting to the previous servile practice of higher Islamic officials. Djozo's approach to Islam was characterized by two important features: the absolute affirmation of the compatibility between the Qur'anic revelation and reason and thus between Islam and Science,[93] and his distinction between the eternal "concepts" contained in the Qur'anic message and the historicity of the interpretation of these very concepts.[94]

Consequently, Djozo refused the principle of *taqlid* (following the opinions of established legal schools) and strongly endorsed the method of *ijtihad* (individual reasoning) which would allow for a flexible implementation of Qur'anic principles that would take into account

the needs of the Muslim community in their respective historical and social context.[95] His refusal of *taqlid* went even so far as to describe one of the basic sources of Islamic creed, the *sunna* and the *hadith,* as *ijtihad* of the Prophet Muhammad himself; as the Prophet was only a human being, he sought to implement the Qur'anic principle according to the needs of his time and place. This, however, does not mean that his solution is valid for all times.[96]

Although Djozo's formulations of these views were very careful, he was not spared criticism from traditionalist circles.[97] However, he would not have remained the most influential Islamic thinker in Bosnia until his death in 1982 had it not been for his willingness to compromise. Thus, in his *fatwas* he was careful not to completely abandon the traditional opinions of the law schools, which led to contradictions between his reformist approach to religion and his advocacy of certain traditions. Suffice is here to note that Djozo displayed a strong adherence to the principle of *talfiq,* and that one of his students even observed that Djozo's own positions could sometimes be viewed as *taqlid* in the tradition of Muhammad 'Abduh.[98]

The religious anti-traditionalist Djozo put a strong emphasis on the preservation of cultural and historical traditions of Bosnian Muslims in his writings. To be sure, the entanglement between the religious sphere and academic publications on the history and culture of Bosnian Muslims was nothing new. Beginning in 1950, GVIS as the official organ of the Islamic Community published works of secular scholars on the social and cultural history and on the history of literature written by Bosnian Muslims.[99] Furthermore, GVIS paid close attention to publications of the Oriental Institute, of which it provided regular summaries and review articles.[100] On several occasions, GVIS sought to stress the Slavic identity of Bosnian Muslims (as opposed to "Turks", a term that was sometimes pejoratively used by Serb and Croat nationalists when speaking about Bosnian Muslims). A polemical argument about the Bosnian Muslim culture as an integral part of the Slavic and thus Yugoslav cultural history can be found in an article in GVIS, written in 1958 by the Muslim Communist writer Šukrija Kurtović.[101] His essay is a polemic against the qualification of the traditional Bosnian Muslim song (*sevdalinka*) as a "deformation" of Yugoslav folk music, a claim which apparently had been made in a feature of the Belgrade radio station. The broadcast speaker had described the *sevdalinka* as a deviation from the norm of the "true" folk music, which allegedly suffered from the "burden of the confusing and complicated Muslim world" and from a "language and a mentality which do not belong to us".[102] The Communist Kurtović, renowned for its pro-Serb position in the interwar period, used the organ of the Islamic Community to protest against this classification of the Muslim cultural heritage as "foreign".

In the following two decades, the intersections between the religious and secular fields with regard to the affirmation of a Bosnian Muslim national identity became denser, as is obvious in Husein Djozo's successful attempts to integrate the works of secular academics in religious publications. The historian Purivatra, one of the most active authors in the struggle for a scholarly justification of Bosnian Muslim nation building, recalls a very intense cooperation between himself and Djozo during the campaign for the population census of 1971.[103] According to Purivatra's reports, Djozo organized seminars and lectures

for the officials of the Islamic Community, at which historians and intellectuals as well as Communist politicians delivered speeches on the Muslim nationality. The goal of these seminars was to enable Muslim Imams to propagate the concept of a Muslim nationality among the members of their communities (*džemat*). Purivatra's and Suljević's guideline for the self-declaration of Muslims during the census was distributed in the mosques by members of the *Ilmija*.[104] Furthermore, the journal *Preporod* provided a forum for texts written by Muslim intellectuals and Bosnian Communists (some of them non-Muslims) which emphasized the existence of a Bosnian Muslim nation.[105]

While the religious press provided the space for intellectuals to popularize the results of their academic works on Bosnian Muslim national identity, it also engaged in the frequently occurring polemics with non-Muslims about the impact of Islamic/Ottoman rule in Bosnia and the nature of Islam in general. The very first issue of *Preporod* brought critical responses written by young Muslim students actively engaged in the "Youth Tribune";[106] their texts were directed against the image of Islam presented in a public lecture by a Bosnian Oriental scholar. In the following issue, *Preporod* published a polemical reply to a series of articles in a Catholic journal about the violent nature of the Ottoman conquest in the Balkans.[107] Such polemics were nothing new in the Islamic press, which had a long history of polemical reactions to perceived attacks on Islamic culture and Islamic religion,[108] but the frequency of such reactions in *Preporod* turned the journal into the forum for polemical Muslim voices. One particularly fierce rebuttal of Sušić's *Parergon*, a work commissioned by Bosnian Communists and reflecting the Party line at that time, led to charges of Muslim nationalism against *Preporod*, the dissolution of its editorial department, and to Djozo's resignation from the position of the president of the *Ilmija* in 1979.

At the beginning of the 1970s, however, such a prospect seemed hardly imaginable. Islamic scholars, of which Djozo was the most prominent one, employed the language of religion and the form of religious texts to foster the identification of Muslim believers with the Muslim nation. In his *fatwa*s (religious opinions) written between 1965 and 1977 Djozo acted not only as a *mufti*, but also as an advocate of secular-national traditions of Muslims in Bosnia, affirming the cultural heritage of Bosnian Muslims in *fatwa*s on certain practices which he explicitly identified as cultural and not as religious.

One of such practices was the avoidance of intermarriage between even distant relatives among Bosnian Muslims.[109] In one *fatwa* on this issue, Djozo pointed out that marriages between relatives of the first and higher grades were allowed according to the Shari'a. He further stressed that this was a customary practice in some Islamic countries. However, he affirmed that the habit of Bosnian Muslims was correct and rightful. Djozo's argumentation in this case was that actions which are *allowed* by the Shari'a are not necessarily *recommended* (*mandub*).

On another occasion, a 15-year-old Muslim girl asked Djozo whether her religious practice is valid even if she has been given a non-Muslim name by her parents.[110] Djozo's answer was short and positive. His commentary accompanying this answer, however, was more elaborate and went far beyond the original question. Djozo did not indulge in an attempt to legitimize his answer, but instead elaborated on the girl's psychological problems

apparent from her question. Djozo interpreted these problems as symptoms of an identity crisis caused by the behavior of the girl's parents: Driven by complexes of inferiority, they had renounced their own cultural tradition and identity and had given their daughter a non-Muslim name. Djozo explained this as follows: "The personal name is a part of one's history and also a part of one's personality. He who has no respect for the name has neither respect for himself nor for his own history. Our peoples have been subjected to foreign rule for centuries, but they have kept their names and their languages. This is something they can be proud of."[111] Djozo was even more explicit in another *fatwa* on the same topic: The personal name is not something regulated by religion.[112] He cited as examples the Meccan *mushriks* (polytheists) who had converted to Islam but had kept their previous names. Djozo even admitted that the Arabic names, which later acquired an Islamic character, originated from a period of idolatry and polytheism. This part of the *fatwa* is short and comprises about a quarter of the whole answer, whereas the rest is dedicated to the issue of national identity. According to Djozo, the name of a person is a component of the historical existence of a people and a determinant of the identity and distinctiveness of a community: "The name does not only designate a physical person. It is even more important because it designates a certain tradition, a history, values, and individuality."[113] Djozo concluded this *fatwa* stating that for the Bosnian Muslims, the time of self-alienation has come to an end: "We are finally getting back to ourselves."[114] Djozo repeated his view that the name symbolizes a cultural tradition and not a religious affiliation in other *fatwas* as well.[115]

We find a similar attitude concerning the meanwhile famous question of whether it is allowed for a Muslim to wear a hat or a cap. Djozo makes a clear statement that this question does not fall into the realm of religion.[116] The manner of clothing is nothing determined by Islamic regulations, but a matter of tradition and folklore. His *fatwa* does not stop here: The fact that the kind of clothing is not determined by Islamic religion does not mean that everything which has emerged as a part of Islamic culture (sic!) through history is to be abandoned now. Folklore is a form of contribution of Islam to the world culture, and as such it should be respected: "A community which has no respect for its own (tradition) has no respect for the (tradition) of another either."[117] From the perspective of religious law, the question of wearing a hat is hence absolutely irrelevant; but the clothes and the personal names alike symbolize the *cultural* identity of Muslims and are to be preserved. As much as Djozo would have liked "to remove this point from the agenda once and for all", he was not spared further questions on this issue. His answers remained the same, as did his appreciation of the traditional symbols of the cultural identity of Bosnian Muslims: "The frivolous abandoning of customs and traditions, i.e. of all attributes of individuality, is always a clear sign of the decay of a community, of its gradual extinction and of its assimilation into something different."[118]

In an article arguing for the opening of the Faculty of Islamic Theology, published in 1973, Djozo stressed the impact of an Islamic institution of higher learning for the national identity of Muslims: "(T)his question should be of interest to every Muslim, *regardless of the fact whether he is a member of the Islamic Community or only a Muslim in the national sense*. It is obvious that the study of Islam in a modern, scientific, and critical way will help

us discover ourselves more quickly and easily, learn about our intellectual foundations and values and analyze our historical existence more correctly. In a time when Islamic culture and its values are being completely recognized and affirmed as a distinct and specific element within the mosaic of common achievements of Yugoslav people, the question about their intellectual foundation is essential. It cannot be denied that the Islam has played a decisive role in the formation of our historical being, of our distinct identity and individuality and of the Muslim intellectual heritage as a whole. (...) The new Islamic Faculty in Sarajevo, which has to be placed on a most healthy and modes in foundation will be a most valuable contribution in this regard."[119]

Djozo challenged the image of Islam as a backward religion frozen in time, blamed for "backwardness" not only by Communists. He instead offered the image of an open, lively, and dynamic religion which, to speak in his own words, "offered to life as much as life requires in that moment, by using all modern means and achievements."[120] With this image, he provided a whole new generation of Muslims, just about to rediscover and establish its own identity, with positive patterns of identification grounded in the Islamic religion.

Djozo's *fatwas*, written in the time between 1965 and 1977 when the cultural and national identities of the Bosnian Muslims became an important part of the academic and political discourses in Bosnia and Herzegovina and a political factor in the broader Yugoslav context, reveal the agency of Islamic scholars within these processes. Furthermore, they show that Bosnian Muslim secular national identity was argued in the language of Islamic reformism along the language of the secular academia and the shifting doctrines (and rhetoric) of the Communist officials.

NOTES

1. Numerous historical works have addressed the question of nation building among Bosnian Muslims. The following is a selection of works in languages other than Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian: Smail Balić, *Das unbekannte Bosnien. Europas Brücke zur islamischen Welt*, Köln et al.1992; Ivo Banać, *The National Question in Yugoslavia, Origins, History, Politics*, Ithaca 1984; Srecko M. Džaja, *Die politische Realität des Jugoslawismus (1918-1991): Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Bosnien-Herzegowinas*, München 2002; Muhamed Hadžijahić, "Die Anfänge der nationalen Entwicklung in Bosnien-Herzegowina", in: *Südostforschungen* XXI (1962), 168-193; Aydin Babuna, *Die nationale Entwicklung der bosnischen Muslime mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der österreichisch-ungarischen Periode*, Frankfurt am Main 1996; Francine Friedman, *The Bosnian Muslims: Denial of a Nation*, Oxford 1996; Pedro Ramet, "Primordial Ethnicity or Modern Nationalism: The Case of Yugoslavia's Muslims", in: *Nationalities Papers* XIII/2 (1985); Mark Pinson (ed.), *The Muslims of Bosnia-Herzegovina: Their Historic Development from the Middle Ages to the Dissolution of Yugoslavia*, Cambridge 1994; Wolfgang Höpken, "Die jugoslawischen Kommunisten und die bosnischen Muslime", in: Andreas Kappeler/Gerhard Simon/Georg Brunner (eds.), *Die Muslime in der Sowjetunion und in Jugoslawien*, Köln 1989, 181-210; Höpken, "Konfession, territoriale Identität und nationales Bewusstsein: Die Muslime in Bosnien zwischen österreichisch-ungarischer Herrschaft und Zweitem Weltkrieg (1878-1941)", in: E. Schmidt-Hartmann (ed.), *Formen des nationalen Bewusstseins im Lichte zeitgenössischer Nationalismustheorien*, München 1994, 233-253.

2. Höpken, "Die jugoslawischen Kommunisten und die bosnischen Muslime", 194.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid, 199.
5. Fikret Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation in Bosnia-Hercegovina: A Historiographic Discussion", in: Fikret Adanir/Suraiya Faroqhi (eds.), *The Ottomans and the Balkans. A Discussion of Historiography*, Leiden/Boston/Köln 2002, 267-304; Höpken, "Die jugoslawischen Kommunisten und die bosnischen Muslime", 198-99.
6. Not before 1994 did the official designation for Bosnian Muslim nationality change into *Bosniak* (*Bošnjak*, fem. *Bošnjakinja, Bošnjanka*), thus separating religious affiliation from nationality on the linguistic level. Even so, the Islamic religious denomination and the Bosniak nationality are still tied together, as the non-Muslim citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina do not regard themselves as Bosniaks, but rather as Serbs or as Croats. However, a number of Bosnian citizens of all religious denominations today prefer the option *Bosnian*, thus referring to the Bosnian state rather than to a particular ethnicity.
7. Pedro Ramet, "Die Muslime Bosniens als Nation", in: Kappeler et al., *Die Muslime in der Sowjetunion und in Jugoslawien*, 107.
8. William Lockwood, *European Moslems. Economy and Ethnicity in Western Bosnia*, New York 1975; Cornelia Sorabji, "Islam and Bosnia's Muslim nation", in: F.W. Carter/H.T. Norris (eds.), *The Changing Shape of the Balkans*, Boulder 1996, 54.
9. Richard Crampton, *Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century*, London, New York 1994, 5, quoted in Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 284.
10. On the Balkan historiography about the Ottoman Empire see Maria Todorova, "The Ottoman Legacy in the Balkans", in: L. Carl Brown (ed.), *Imperial Legacy. The Ottoman Imprint in the Balkans and the Middle East*, New York 1995, 45-77; Fikret Adanir, "Balkan Historiography Related to the Ottoman Empire since 1945", in: Kemal H. Karpat (ed.), *Ottoman Past and Today's Turkey*, Leiden 2000, 236-252.
11. Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 284.
12. Aleksandar Solovjev, "Nestanak bogumilstva i islamizacija Bosne", in: *Godišnjak istorijskog društva Bosne i Hercegovine*, I/1949, 42-79; idem, *Vjersko učenje bosanske crkve*, Zagreb 1948; idem, "Engleski izvještaj XVII vijeka o bosanskim Poturima", in: *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja*, VII/1952, 101-109.
13. Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 285.
14. The current state of the debate about the role of the Bogumils in the Islamization of Bosnia and Herzegovina is discussed in Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 285-290.
15. John V.A. Fine, *The Bosnian Church: A New Interpretation. A Study of the Bosnian Church and Its Place in State and Society from the 13th to the 15th Centuries*, New York/London 1975.
16. The Bogumils became a topic of a controversy at the beginning of 2006, when Dubravko Lovrenović, a historian of medieval Bosnia from Sarajevo, published an article in the Bosnian weekly *Dani*, in which he attacked the ideological instrumentalization of the Bogumil myth by Islamic officials and some Bosniak historians. The insistence on the myth of the Bogumils, Lovrenović maintained, invokes an image of history in which the Bosniak element is depicted as the main heir of the medieval Bosnian state tradition; such an image has negative implications for the political and national cohesion of the current Bosnian state. The polemics were taken up

by Bosniak historians and Orientalists such as Ahmed Zildžić, Jasna Šamić, Nenad Filipović and Sremko Džaja (*Nezavisni magazin BH Dani*, no. 449-455, Sarajevo, January 21–March 3, 2006).

17. The images of converts to Islam have been a constitutive element of Serbian nationalist historiography since the 19th century: see Bojan Aleksov, "Poturica gori od Turèina. Srpski istoričari o verskim preobraćenjima", in: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu (ed.), *Historijski mitovi na Balkanu. Zbornik radova*, Sarajevo 2003, 225-258; Aleksov, "Perception of Islamization in the Serbian National Discourse", in: *Journal of Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, Vol. 5, no. 1 (2005), 113-127; idem, "Die Interpretation des religiösen Bekenntiswechsels bei der Herausbildung des serbischen Nationalbewusstseins", in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte und Kultur Südosteuropas*, 4/2002, 39-67. The dominant tendencies within the South East European historiography (Bulgaria, Macedonia, Albania, Greece and Turkey) are discussed in Antonina Zhelyazkova, "Islamization in the Balkans as an Historiographical Problem: The Southeast European Perspective", in: Adanir/Faroqhi (eds.), *The Ottomans and the Balkans. A Discussion of Historiography*, 223-266.
18. Wayne S. Vuchinich, "The Yugoslav Lands in the Ottoman Period: Postwar Marxist Interpretations of Indigenous and Ottoman Institutions", in: *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 27, no. 3 (1955), 287.
19. Nedim Filipović, *Pogled na osmanski feudalizam (sa naročitim osvrtom na agrarne odnose)*, Sarajevo 1952; see also Fazileta Cviko, "Survey of Development of Yugoslav Ottoman Studies–Pregled razvoja jugoslovenske osmanistike", in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju/Revue de philologie orientale*, 36/1986 (1987), 7-36.
20. Vuchinich, "The Yugoslav Lands in the Ottoman Period", 293-296.
21. Vuchinich, "The Yugoslav Lands in the Ottoman Period", 290.
22. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju i istoriju jugoslovenskih naroda pod turskom vladavinom/ Revue de philologie orientale et d'histoire des peuples yougoslaves sous la domination turque*. The first issue was published in Sarajevo in 1950.
23. *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju/ Revue de philologie orientale*, No. VIII-IX (1958-9), Sarajevo 1960.
24. For a survey of Djurdjev's life and work see Enver Redžić (ed.), *Branislav Đurđev – ličnost i djelo*, Sarajevo 2003.
25. An overview of the academic achievement Filipović's is to be found in a conference volume published in 2000 in Sarajevo (Enver Redžić (ed.), *Naučno djelo Nedima Filipovića*, Sarajevo 2000).
26. "Radnici Orijentalnog instituta 1950.-2000.", in: *Orijentalni institut u Sarajevu 1950.-2000.*, Sarajevo 2000, 97-171; Džemal Ćehajić, *Derviški redovi u jugoslovenskim zemljama sa posebnim osvrtom na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, Sarajevo 1986, 57.
27. "Radnici Orijentalnog instituta 1950.-2000.", 102-103.
28. Šaćir Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika u XX. stoljeću*, Sarajevo 1998, 229. According to Filandra, the first "renaissance" took off at the end of the 19th century with the emergence of the first national organizations and modern political parties among the Bosniaks.
29. Spiro Kulišić, "Razmatranja o porijeklu Muslimana u Bosni i Hercegovini", in: *Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja*, VIII/1953, 157.

30. For a critical overview of these works see Enver Redžić, *Sto godina muslimanske politike u tezama i kontroverzama istorijske nauke,* Sarajevo 2000, 25-46.
31. Nedim Filipović, "Napomene o islamizaciji u Bosni i Hercegovini u 15. vijeku", in: *Godišnjak akademije nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine,* vol. 7 (1950), 141-67; idem, "Osvrt na pitanje islamizacije na Balkanu pod Turcima", in: *Prilozi Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu,* 11-12/1975-76; idem, "O problemima društvenog i etničkog razvitka u doba osmanske vlasti", in: *Prilozi Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu,* Sarajevo, 11-12/1975-1976, 274-282.
32. Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 296-299. The notion of Bosnian exclusivity has recently been subject to criticism by non-Bosnian Ottomanists: see Markus Koller, "Introduction", in: Markus Koller/Kemal Karpat (eds,), *Ottoman Bosnia. A History in Peril,* Madison 2004, 1-26, particularly pp. 4-8.
33. Avdo Sućeska, "Neke specifičnosti Bosne pod Turcima", in: *Prilozi Instituta za istoriju u Sarajevu,* 4/1968, 43-57.
34. Avdo Sućeska, *Ajani: Prilog izučavanju lokalne vlasti u našim zemljama za vrijeme Turaka,* Sarajevo 1965.
35. Avdo Sućeska, "Seljačke bune u Bosni u XVII i XVIII stoljeću" in: *Godišnjak Društva istoričara Bosne i Hercegovine,* 17/1966-67, 163-207.
36. Most prominently, the uprising of the local notable Husein-kapetan Gradaščević (1802-34) in the years 1831-32 has become a symbol of an anti-Ottoman struggle for the national sovereignty of Bosnia. In the popular historical memory, Gradaščević is remembered as the "Dragon of Bosnia" (*Zmaj od Bosne*) and continues to be revered in popular folk songs and tales. For recent interpretations of the uprising and of Gradaščević's biography see Ahmed Alièić, *Pokret za autonomiju Bosne od 1831. do 1832. godine,* Sarajevo 1996; Husnija Kamberović, *Husein-kapetan Gradaščević (1802-1834). Biografija: Uz dvjestu godišnjicu rođenja,* Gradačac 2002.
37. Avdo Sućeska, "Istorijske osnove nacionalne posebnosti bosansko-hercegovačkih Muslimana", in: *Jugoslovenski istorijski časopis,* 4/1969, 47-54.
38. In Bosnia, this interpretation has been particularly advanced in Nedim Filipović's monumental work on the Sufi and rebel Sheikh Badraddin (1358-1416), begun in 1960 and published in 1971: Nedim Filipović, *Princ Musa i Šejh Bedredin,* Sarajevo 1971.
39. Adem Handžić/Muhamed Hadžijahić, "O progonu hamzevija u Bosni 1573 godine", in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju,* XX-XXI/1970-71 (1974), 51-70; Muhamed Hadžijahić, "Zapostavljene revolucionarne tradicije: Hamza Orlović i Hamzevije", in: *Pregled,* 11-12/1970, 591-595. For an overview of the rich corpus of works on the Hamzawiyya brotherhood see: Alexandre Popovic, "Les ordres mystiques musulmans du Sud-Est européen dans la période post-ottomane", in: *Les Ordres mystiques dans l'Islam. Cheminements et situation actuelle* (Travaux publiés sous la direction de A. Popovic et G. Veinstein), Paris 1986, 87.
40. Enver Redžić, "Društveno-istorijski aspekti 'nacionalnog opredjeljenja' Muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine", in: *Socijalizam* 3/1961, 31-89; idem, *Prilozi o nacionalnom pitanju,* Sarajevo 1963; idem, *Tokovi i otpori,* Sarajevo 1970; idem, "O posebnosti bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana", in: *Pregled* LX/4 (1970), 457-488; Muhamed Hadžijahiž, "Die Anfänge der nationalen Entwicklung in Bosnien und in der Herzegowina", in: *Südost-Forschungen,* 21/ 1962, 168-193; idem, *Etnogeneza bosanskih Muslimana,* Sarajevo 1973 ; idem, *Od tradicije do identiteta. Geneza nacionalnog pitanja bosanskih Muslimana,* Sarajevo 1974; Atif Purivatra,

Nacionalni i politički razvitak Muslimana (rasprave i članci), Sarajevo 1969; idem, "Muslimanska komponenta u jugoslovenskom nacionalnom mozaiku", (article series) in: *Oslobodjenje*, August 13–August 19, 1969; idem, "On the National Phenomenon of the Muslims of Bosnia-Hercegovina", in: Nada Ragić (ed.), *Nations and Nationalities in Yugoslavia*, Belgrade 1974, 305-327; Salim Ćerić, *Muslimani srpsko-hrvatskog jezika*, Sarajevo 1968.

41. Muhamed Hadžijahić/Atif Purivatra, *Stav Muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine u pogledu nacionalnog opredjeljenja. Nacrt za bibliografiju*, Sarajevo 1968.
42. Mustafa Imamović, "U okviru preporodnih pregnuća", in: Fadil Ademović (ed.), *Vrijeme uspravljanja Bošnjaka. Atif Purivatra–život i djelo*, Sarajevo 2002, 13-17.
43. Atif Purivatra/Kasim Suljević, *Nacionalni aspekt popisa stanovništva u 1971. godini*, Sarajevo 1971.
44. Fadil Ademović, "Politički argumentovano i znanstveno utemeljeno", in: idem (ed.), *Vrijeme uspravljanja Bošnjaka*, 49-51.
45. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika*, 283-284; Fadil Ademović, "Atifovo neslaganje sa Ćimićem", in: idem, *Vrijeme uspravljanja Bošnjaka*, 125-126.
46. Ademović, "Atifovo neslaganje sa Ćimićem", 126.
47. Ibid, 129.
48. Atif Purivatra, *Nacionalni i politički razvitak Muslimana (rasprave i članci)*, Sarajevo 1969.
49. The text of the review in Ademović (ed.), *Vrijeme uspravljanja Bošnjaka*, 155-160.
50. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika*, 283-284.
51. Džaja, *Die politische Realität*, 255; idem, "Bosanska povijesna stvarnost i njezini mitološki odrazi", in: Institut za istoriju u Sarajevu (ed.), *Historijski mitovi na Balkanu*, 48. A similar criticism has also been voiced by Enver Redžić (*Sto godina muslimanske politike*, 47).
52. Redžić, *Sto godina muslimanske politike*, 86; idem, "Istoriografija o 'muslimanskoj' naciji", in: *Prilozi Instituta za istoriju Sarajevo*, 29/2000, 233-244.
53. See footnote 41.
54. Redžić, "Istoriografija o 'muslimanskoj' naciji", 234 (all translations from the Bosnian language by A.O.).
55. Enver Redžić "O posebnosti bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana", in: *Pregled*, LX/4 (1970), 457-488.
56. Redžić, "O posebnosti bosanskohercegovačkih Muslimana", 477.
57. *Bosanski pogledi. Nezavisni list muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine u iseljeništvu 1960-67*, reprint London 1984; see also Mustafa Imamović, *Bošnjaci u emigraciji*, Sarajevo 1996, esp. 141 ff.
58. For Zulfikarpašić's biographies see Šaćir Filandra/Enes Karić, *Bošnjaèka ideja*, Zagreb 2002; Milovan Đilas/Nadežda Gaæe, *Bošnjak Adil Zulfikarpašić*, Zürich 1994.
59. Christiane Dick, "Aus Muslimen werden Bosniaken. Der Beitrag Adil Zulfikarpašićs zur Konstruktion und Anerkennung des Bosniakentums", in: *Jahrbücher für Gechichte und Kultur Südosteuropas*, 4/2002, 109-129.
60. Smail Balić, *Kultura Bošnjaka. Muslimanska komponenta*, Wien 1973.
61. Dick, "Aus Muslimen werden Bosniaken", 110-111.

62. Armina Omerika, *Islam in Bosnien-Herzegowina: Die jugoslawische Erfahrung. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Netzwerke der Jungmuslime (1941-1983)* (dissertation, to be defended at the Ruhr-University in Bochum, Germany in spring 2007).
63. Zulfikarpašić's explanation of his political controversy with the former Bosnian president Izetbegović illustrates this self-portrayal clearly: According to Zulfikarpašić, the dispute between himself and Izetbegović was due to the religious symbolism which Izetbegoviæ and his party employed during the political mobilization of the Bosniaks. Such tactics was supposedly not in accordance with Zulfikarpašić's conception of a strictly secular national identity of Bosniaks (Đilas/Gaće, *Bošnjak Adil Zulfikarpašić,* 162-164).
64. *Bosanski pogledi,* no. 1 (August 15, 1960), 23.
65. Omer Mušić, "Mostar u turskoj pjesmi iz XVII vijeka", in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju,* XIV-XV/1964-65 (1969), 73-100; Džemal Ćehajić, "Pjesme Fevzije Mostarca na turskom jeziku", in: *Prilozi,* XVIII-XIX/1968-69 (1973), 285-314; Alija Nametak, "Nov prilog bosanskoj aljamiado literaturi", in: *Prilozi,* XII-XIII/1962-63 (1965); idem, "Jedna aljamiado pjesma iz janjarskog kodeksa s početka XIX stoljeća", in: *Prilozi,* XXII-XXIII/1972-73 (1976), 329-344; Lamija Hadžiosmanović, "Dvije neobjavljene pjesme o banjalučkom boju iz Kadićeve Hronike", in: *Prilozi,* XXII-XXIII/1972-73 (1976), 315-327; Fehim Nametak, "Epska pjesma na turskom jeziku o prilikama u Bosni", in: *Prilozi,* XXII-XXIII/1972-73 (1976), 383-394; idem, "Fadil-pašina kasida kao odgovor na Zija-pašinu Zafernamu", in: *Prilozi,* 28-29/1978-79 (1980); Muhamed Hadžijahić, "Muslimanska književna tradicija", in: *Bosansko-hercegovačka književna hrestomatija. 1 dio: Starija književnost,* Sarajevo 1974, 221-232; idem, "Neposredni zadaci u izuèavanju naših alhamijado tekstova", in: Midhat Begić (ed.), *Naučni skup: Književnost Bosne i Hercegovine u svjetlu dosadašnjih istraživanja (Sarajevo 26. i 27. maja 1976),* Sarajevo 1977, 41-51.
66. Hazim Šabanović, *Književnost Muslimana BiH na orijentalnim jezicima,* Sarajevo 1973.
67. Balić, *Kultura Bošnjaka,* 53-122.
68. See review of Balić's book by the German Ottomanist Michael Ursinus (*Die Welt des Islams,* (new series), vol. 21, no. 1/4 (1981), 248-249.
69. See overview of the discussion in Adanir, "The Formation of a 'Muslim' Nation", 299-301.
70. Vančo Boškov, "Neka razmišljanja o književnosti *na turskom jeziku u Bosni i Hercegovini*", *in:* Begić (ed.), *Nauèni skup: Književnost Bosne i Hercegovine* , 53-64; "Diskusija: Džemal Ćehajić" in: ibid, 227-229; Alexandre Popovic, "La littérature ottomane des musulmans yougoslaves", in: *Journal Asiatique,* vol. CCLIX, no. 3-4 (1971), 309-376; idem, "La littérature ottomane des musulmanes des pays yougoslaves: sur quelques problèmes de méthodologie", in: *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju,* 30/1980, 359-368; idem, "Représentation du passé et transmission de l'identité chez les Musulmans des Balkans. Mythes et réalités", in: Daniel Panzac (ed.), *Les Balkans à l'époque ottomane* (*Revue du monde Musulman et de la Méditerranée,* no. 66, 1992/4), 139-144.
71. Muhamed Filipović, "Bosanski duh u knjiiževnosti – šta je to?", in: *Život,* Sarajevo 1967; citation according to reprint in the online literature magazine *Duh Bosne,* vol. I, no.1 (January 2006), http://www.spiritofbosnia.org.
72. Ešref Kovaèević, *Muhammed Resulullah,* Sarajevo 1981.
73. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika,* 259 ff.

74. Ibid, 262.
75. Ibid, 263.
76. Ibid, 267.
77. Alija Isaković, *Biserje – izbor iz muslimanske književnosti*, Zagreb 1972.
78. The term "alhamijado" in the Bosnian context refers to the literature written in the Bosnian language and in the Arabic script.
79. Filandra, *Bošnjačka politika,* S. 274.
80. Muhsin Rizvić, *Književno stvaranje muslimanskih pisaca u Bosni i Hercegovini u doba austro-ugarske vladavine*, Sarajevo 1973.
81. Musin Rizvić, *Književni život BiH između dva rata*, vol. I-III, Sarajevo 1980.
82. Pero Šimunović, "Stare zablude i novi zanosi", in: *Književnost,* No. 9, Belgrade 1982, 1395-1413.
83. Šimunović, "Stare zablude i novi zanosi", 1399. In another article, Šimunović stated that a group of armed *mujaheddin* had been observed at the premises of the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo (Pero Šimunović, "Da li su u pitanju samo zanosi ili kako se postaje slučaj", in: *Književnost,* No. 3-4, Belgrade 1983, 699-721).
84. Ibid, 1401; Šimunović, "Da li su u pitanju samo zanosi", 705, 712.
85. Ibid, 720.
86. Džaja, *Die politische Realität*, 255.
87. Derviš Sušić, *Parergon-Bilješke uz roman o Talu,* Sarajevo 1980.
88. Sušić, *Parergon,* 7.
89. This view was expressed by Fuad Muhić, a professor of law at the University of Sarajevo, in the afterword of the book ("Pogovor", in: Sušić, *Parergon,* 271-298).
90. Fikret Karèić, "Islamic Revival in the Balkans, 1970-92", in: *Islamic Studies*, vol. 36:2, no. 3 (1997), 565-581.
91. Nijaz Šukrić, "Islamska zajednica u Bosni i Hercegovini nakon oslobođenja", in: Muhamed Hadžijahić (ed.), *Islam i Muslimani u Bosni i Hercegovini,* Sarajevo 1977, 159.
92. "Informacija o štrajku učenika Gazi Husrevbegove medrese u Sarajevu", in: *Glasnik Vrhovnog islamskog starješinstva u SFRJ* (in the following: GVIS*),* 35/1-2 (1972), 198-208.
93. Husein Djozo, "Islam i nauka", in: *GVIS*, XX/3-4 (1974), 113-123. In several of his *fatwas*, Djozo elaborated his view about the organic connection between sciences and Islam. In this spirit, he issued a *fatwa* affirming Darwin's theory of evolution, organ donations and the determination of physical maturity according to the achievements of medicine and anthropology (Husein Djozo, *Pitanja i odgovori. Fetve u vremenu. 1965-1977*, Srebrenik 1996, 28-29, 282, 222-223).
94. Husein Djozo, "Smisao obnove islamske misli", in: *Takvim* 1975/1385, Sarajevo 1975; idem, "Potreba i pokušaji savremene interpretacije i egzegeze kur'anske misli", in: *Zbornik radova Islamskog teološkog fakulteta u Sarajevu,* vol. 1, Sarajevo 1982, 11-26.
95. "Šta je idžtihad i ko bi ga trebao otvoriti", in: Đozo, *Fetve u vremenu,* 17.
96. Husein Djozo, *Islam u vremenu*, Sarajevo 1976, 27-29.

97. Among conservative Muslims of Sarajevo, Djozo was occasionally called Jozo–a commutation of his name into an explicitly Christian name (Alija Nametak, *Sarajevski nekrologij*, Sarajevo 184), and for many, his "progressivism" consisted merely in "allowing that which was forbidden". Djozo apparently also received anonymous letters in which he was accused of faithlessness (Ibrahim Džananović, "Kratak osvrt na odgovore Husein ef. Đoze u rubrici Glasnika 'Pitanja i odgovori'", in: *Preporod*, 12/614 (1997), 18; Enes Karić, "Istaknuti alim svoga vremena", (article series) in: *Preporod*, 7/609-12/614 (1997), here: *Preporod*, 7/609, 13).
98. Kariæ, "Istaknuti alim svoga vremena", in: *Preporod*, 7/609, 13.
99. See exemplarily Hazim Šabanoviæ, "Ko je osnovao sarajevsku Ferhadiju", in: *GVIS*, IV/1-4 (1953), 32-40; Ahmed Aličić, "Početak i osnova Islama", in: *GVIS*, IV/5-7 (1953), 138-141; Osman Sokolović, "Pregled štampanih djela na srpsko-hrvatskom jeziku muslimana BiH od 1878-1948 godine", in: *GVIS*, VI/1-2, 36-41, *GVIS*, VI/3-4, 101-111, *GVIS*, VI/5-7 (1955), 169-174, and *GVIS*, VI/8-10, 289-296; Hajrudin Ćurić, "Jedna obaveza bosansko-hercegovačkih prvaka iz 1834 godine", in: *GVIS*, VI/5-7 (1955), 168-169; Alija Nametak, "Statistički podaci o broju stanovništva u Bosni i Hercegovini u posljednjih stotinu godina, so osobitim obzirom na Muslimane", in: *GVIS*, IX/3-5 (1958), 139-157.
100. Edhem Bulbulović, "Orijentalizam i Islamska enciklopedija", in: *GVIS* , IV/5-7 (1953), 125-133; Abdulah Škaljić, "Izašao je iz štampe novi broj časopisa Orijentalnog Institutau Sarajevu", in: *GVIS* V/4-6 (1954), 96-99; Hajrudin Ćurić, "Bibliografija–pregled sadržaja 'Priloga za orijentalnu filologiju i istoriju jugoslovenskih naroda pod turskom vladavinom (1950-1955)'", in: *GVIS*, VII/10-12 (1956), 327-331.
101. Šukrija Kurtović, "Sevdalinka – naša narodna pjesma", in: *GVIS*, IX/3-5 (1958), 184-188.
102. Kurtović, "Sevdalinka–naša narodna pjesma", 185.
103. Atif Purivatra, "Uloga Husein ef. Đoze u popisu stanovništva 1971. godine", in: *Preporod*, 12/614 (1997), 13.
104. Ibid.
105. Ibid. During March and April 1971, several issues of *Preporod* brought texts written by Bosnian Communist politicians about the Bosnian Muslim nation (*Preporod* II/12, II/13, II/14 [1971]); F.B., "Muslimani su posebna nacija", in: *Preporod*, II/12 (1971), S. 3; "Muslimani u popisu stanovništva", in: *Preporod*, I/4 (1970), 10; "Za slobodno izražavanje svoje nacionalnosti", in: *Preporod*, I/5 (1970), 3; "Nacionalna afirmacija Muslimana", in: *Preporod*, II/14 (1971), 8. See also the review of Purivatra's influential study on the Yugoslav Muslim Organization, the most important Muslim political party in the interwar period, written by an anonymous author in *Glasnik* (*GVIS*, 33/1-2 [1970], 212).
106. *Preporod*, I/4 (1970), 4; the texts were written by Timur Numić and Husein Živalj. The latter published his texts under the initials "H.Ž".
107. H. Ž (Husein Živalj), "Da li su Turci (Muslimani) palili manastire?", in: *Preporod*, I/5 (1970), 12.
108. See an earlier polemics between Djozo and the Franciscan scholar Branko Kirilić (N.N. [Husein Djozo], "Marija majka Isusova u Kuranu i u islamskoj predaji", in: *GVIS*, IX/6-8 [1958], 276-285; N.N. [Husein Djozo], "Jedno objašnjenje", in: *GVIS*, X/4-6 [1959], 157-165), as well as his polemic reply to the Serb writer Milivoje Perović (N.N. [Husein Djozo], "Povodom članka 'Zemlja u kojoj su se radjali bogovi'", in: *GVIS*, XIII/1-2 [1962], 3-10).

109. Djozo, *Fetve u vremenu*, 207-208, 211.
110. *Ibid*, 200-203.
111. *Ibid*, 202.
112. *Ibid*, 250-252.
113. *Ibid*, 251.
114. *Ibid*, 252.
115. *Ibid*, 252-254.
116. *Ibid*, 230-231.
117. *Ibid*, S. 231.
118. *Ibid*, S. 231-232.
119. Husein Djozo, "Otvaranje Islamskog fakulteta u Sarajevu", in: *GVIS*, 36/7-8 (1973), 60 (emphasis by A.O.).
120. Djozo, "Potreba i pokušaji savremene interpretacije i egzegeze kur'anske misli", 21.